(a) RESERVATION.—The advice and consent of the Senate is subject to the following reservation, which shall be included in the instrument of ratification and shall be binding on the President:

PROTECTION FOR ASEXUALLY REPRODUCED VARIETIES.—Pursuant to article 35(2), the United States will continue to provide protection for asexually reproduced varieties by an industrial property title other than a breeder's right and will not, therefore, apply the terms of this Convention to those varieties.

(b) DECLARATION.—The advice and consent of the Senate is subject to the following declarations:

(1) LIMITED RESERVATIONS PROVISIONS.—It is the Sense of the Senate that a ''limited reservations'' proviso, such as that contained in Article 35, has the effect of inhibiting the Senate in its exercise of its constitutional duty to give advice and consent to ratification of a treaty, and the Senate's approval of this treaty should not be construed as a precedent for acquiescence to future treaties containing such a provision.

(2) TREATY INTERPRETATION.—The Senate affirms the applicability to all treaties of the constitutionally based principles of treaty interpretation set forth in Condition (1) of the resolution of ratification of the INF Treaty, approved by the Senate on May 27, 1988, and Condition (8) of the resolution of ratification of the Document Agreed Among the States Parties to the Treaty on Conventional Armed Forces in Europe, approved by the Senate on May 14, 1997.

(c) PROVISO.—The resolution of ratification is subject to the following proviso, which shall be binding on the President:

SUPREMACY OF THE CONSTITUTION.—Nothing in the Treaty requires or authorizes legislation or other action by the United States of America that is prohibited by the Constitution of the United States as interpreted by the United States.

Treaty Doc. 105–4 International Grains Agreement, 1995 (Exec. Rept. 105–16).

TEXT OF COMMITTEE RECOMMENDED RESOLUTION OF ADVICE AND CONSENT

Resolved, (two-thirds of the Senators present concurring therein), That the Senate advise and consent to the ratification of The Grains Trade Convention and Food Aid Convention constituting the International Grains Agreement, 1995, signed by the United States on June 26, 1995 (Treaty Doc. 105–4), subject to the declaration of subsection (a), and the proviso of subsection (b).

(a) DECLARATION.—The advice and consent of the Senate is subject to the following declarations:

TREATY INTERPRETATION.—The Senate affirms the applicability to all treaties of the constitutionally based principles of treaty interpretation set forth in Condition (1) of the resolution of ratification of the INF Treaty, approved by the Senate on May 27, 1988, and Condition (8) of the resolution of ratification of the Document Agreed Among the States Parties to the Treaty on Conventional Armed Forces in Europe, approved by the Senate on May 14, 1997.

(b) PROVISO.—The resolution of ratification is subject to the following proviso, which shall be binding on the President:

SUPREMACY OF THE CONSTITUTION.—Nothing in the Treaty requires or authorizes legislation or other action by the United States of America that is prohibited by the Constitution of the United States as interpreted by the United States.

Treaty Doc. 105–35 Trademark Law Treaty With Regulations (Exec. Rept. 105–17).

TEXT OF COMMITTEE RECOMMENDED RESOLUTION OF ADVICE AND CONSENT

Resolved (two-thirds of the Senators present concurring therein), That the Senate advise and consent to the ratification of The Trademark Law Treaty done at Geneva October 27, 1994, with Regulations, signed by the United States on October 28, 1994 (Treaty Doc. 105–35), subject to the declarations of subsection (a), and the proviso of subsection (b).

(a) DECLARATIONS.—The advice and consent of the Senate is subject to the following declarations:

(1) LIMITED RESERVATIONS PROVISIONS.—It is the Sense of the Senate that a ''limited reservations'' provision, such as that contained in Article 21, has the effect of inhibiting the Senate in its exercise of its constitutional duty to give advice and consent to ratification of a treaty, and the Senate's approval of this treaty should not be construed as a precedent for acquiescence to future treaties containing such a provision.

(2) TREATY INTERPRETATION.—The Senate affirms the applicability to all treaties of the constitutionally based principles of treaty interpretation set forth in Condition (1) of the resolution of ratification of the INF Treaty, approved by the Senate on May 27, 1988, and Condition (8) of the resolution of ratification of the Document Agreed Among the States Parties to the Treaty on Conventional Armed Forces in Europe, approved by the Senate on May 14, 1997.

(b) PROVISO.—The resolution of ratification is subject to the following proviso, which shall be binding on the President:

SUPREMACY OF THE CONSTITUTION.—Nothing in the Treaty requires or authorizes legislation or other action by the United States of America that is prohibited by the Constitution of the United States as interpreted by the United States.

Treaty Doc. 104–376 Amendments To the Convention On the International Maritime Organization (Exec. Rept. 105–18).

TEXT OF COMMITTEE RECOMMENDED RESOLUTION OF ADVICE AND CONSENT

Resolved (two-thirds of the Senators present concurring therein), That the Senate advise and consent to the ratification of the Amendments to the Convention on the International Maritime Organization, adopted on November 7, 1991, and November 4, 1993 (Treaty Doc. 105–36), subject to the declaration of subsection (a), and the proviso of subsection (b).

(a) DECLARATION.—The advice and consent of the Senate is subject to the following declaration:

TREATY INTERPRETATION.—The Senate affirms the applicability to all treaties of the constitutionally based principles of treaty interpretation set forth in Condition (1) of the resolution of ratification of the INF Treaty, approved by the Senate on May 27, 1988, and Condition (8) of the resolution of ratification of the Document Agreed Among the States Parties to the Treaty on Conventional Armed Forces in Europe, approved by the Senate on May 14, 1997.

(b) PROVISO.—The resolution of ratification is subject to the following proviso, which shall be binding on the President:

SUPREMACY OF THE CONSTITUTION.—Nothing in the Treaty requires or authorizes legislation or other action by the United States of America that is prohibited by the Constitution of the United States as interpreted by the United States.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second time by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. ROBERTS:

S. 2194. A bill to amend the Arms Export Control Act to provide the President with discretionary authority to impose nuclear nonproliferation controls on a foreign country; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. COCHRAN (for himself and Mr. LOTT):

S. 2195. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to sell or exchange the Gulfport Research Laboratory and other Forest Service administrative sites in the State of Mississippi, to provide for a new research facility, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Mr. GORTON (for himself, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. GRAMS, and Mr. BINGAMAN):

S. 2196. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for establishment at the National Heart, Lung, and Blood Institute of a program regarding lifesaving interventions for individuals who experience cardiac arrest, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

By Mr. SANTORUM:

S. 2197. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide an election of a deduction in lieu of a basis increase where indebtedness secured by property has original issue discount and is held by a cash method taxpayer; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. ASHCROFT:

S. 2198. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide for Congressional review of rules establishing or increasing taxes; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. HARKIN (for himself, Mr. BROWNBACK, and Mr. TORRICELLI):

S. Res. 252. A resolution expressing the sense of the Senate regarding a resolution to the Kashmir dispute; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN (for herself and Mr. LEVIN):

S. Con. Res. 104. A concurrent resolution commemorating the 50th anniversary of the integration of the Armed Forces; considered and agreed to.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. ROBERTS:

S. 2194. A bill to amend the Arms Export Control Act to provide the President with discretionary authority to impose nuclear nonproliferation controls on a foreign country; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

NUCLEAR NONPROLIFERATION LEGISLATION

● Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. President, today I am introducing a bill that gives the President full discretionary authority to address the nuclear tests recently conducted by India and Pakistan. My bill does not require the severe mandatory sanctions imposed on India and Pakistan be removed. Nuclear proliferation is a deadly serious issue. The actions of India and Pakistan deserve a strong response from the United States and the rest of the world.

Sanctions are only one of several policy tools. Obviously, one of the best policy weapons we have available is hard-nosed diplomacy to prevent such nuclear incidents from occurring in the first place.

The President must have full flexibility to implement a strong foreign policy that addresses the recklessness of Pakistan, India or any other nation that defines the world community. However, the Administration should be able to do so without the constraints of a Congressionally mandated list of sanctions. This flexibility should also include the authority to remove sanctions when appropriate or when in the best interest of the United States.

Under current law, the United States must impose specific and mandatory sanctions on any non-nuclear weapons state that receives or detonates a nuclear device. This mandated action removes the President's authority to custom-tailor sanctions and set them for a specific period of time. These constraints dangerously restrict the President's ability to respond to world events.

My bill provides the Administration with discretionary authority over sanctions placed on nations that practice nuclear proliferation. The President and his diplomatic corp are given the authority to either impose or not impose sanctions. They can decide the degree of sanctions. They can later remove or modify any sanctions. Additionally, the President is required to report his intentions to Congress within 30 days of informing the violating country of the sanctions. If it disagrees, Congress remains free to react legislatively.

This bill represents an important step toward what I hope will be a critical debate regarding U.S. foreign policy. Unilateral sanctions rarely achieve their goals. Instead, they damage U.S. businesses and workers. They diminish U.S. strength and prestige in international affairs. They generate resentment from allies and competitors alike.

I would remind you that we now have in place unilateral sanctions against more than 70 nations representing almost three-fourths of the world's populations. Those are markets lost to the American economy.

Congress and the Administration must now work together to reassess all instances where unilateral sanctions are imposed. This bill represent an excellent step in the right direction.●

By Mr. GORTON (for himself, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. GRAMS, and Mr. BINGAMAN):

S. 2196. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for establishment at the National Heart, Lung, and Blood Institute of a program regarding lifesaving interventions for individuals who experience cardiac arrest, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

CARDIAC ARREST SURVIVAL ACT

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, every day almost 1,000 Americans suffer from Sudden Cardiac Arrest. It can claim the life of a promising young athlete, a friend or family member regardless of age or health. Sudden Cardiac Arrest occurs when the heart's electrical impulses become chaotic causing the heart to stop pumping blood. Tragically, 95 percent of Americans who suffer from sudden cardiac arrest will die. Today, I am introducing a bill that can change that statistic.

We know that quick implementation of ''Chain of Survival''—calling 911, administering CPR and early access to defibrillation can dramatically improve survival rates for victims of Sudden Cardiac Arrest. Unfortunately, early access to defibrillation may be the most critical link in the chain and the most difficult to come by. The Cardiac Arrest Survival Act aims to improve community access to automatic external defibrillators (AEDs), a machine designed to shock the heart and restore its normal rhythm. If every community across America made this easy-to-use technology more readily available, we could increase the survival rate of cardiac arrest and possibly save 250 lives each day and 100,000 lives each year.

My home state of Washington has a long history of encouraging the use of AEDs. King County, Washington boasts one of the highest cardiac arrest survival rates in the nation at 30 percent—far above the national average survival rate of 5 percent. Communities that have improved survival rates have ensured that Emergency Medical Technicians are trained and equipped with automatic external defibrillators. Some communities have located AEDs in public places like sports stadiums, airports and shopping malls, and others have worked to ensure that police and firefighters, often the first to respond to an emergency, are trained and equipped with AEDs.

Although the technology is proven effective, access to defibrillators outside the hospital setting is limited. Patient care and survival suffer from a patchwork of different state laws. Less than half of the nation's Emergency Medical Technicians are even trained and equipped to use AEDs. The Cardiac Arrest Survival Act aims to reduce the number of cardiac arrest fatalities by encouraging a uniform system of state laws and to improve current emergency medical training programs.

The bill asks the National Heart, Lung, and Blood Institute to work on model state legislation that addresses some of the barriers to community access to AEDs such as good samaritan immunity and public placement of these machines. NHLBI will also work with the National Highway Transportation and Safety Administration to update the current medical training curriculum to reflect the improvement in technology. The bill will also coordinate a database to collect information on cardiac arrest from existing databases on emergency care. While the bill is far from mandating anything, I am convinced we can reduce the number of cardiac arrest fatalities by encouraging states to train more people to use AEDs right on the scene in a way that the state of Washington is already doing.

The Cardiac Arrest Survival Act is the Senate companion to a bill introduced by Congressman STEARNS in the House of Representatives that currently has 80 cosponsors. The bill enjoys broad support from more than seventy associations including the American Heart Association, the American Red Cross, the American Academy of Pediatrics, the Congressional Fire Services Institute Advisory Committee with some 45 members, the Washington State Medical Association, the Washington State Hospital Association and a number of other supporters. I am also pleased to be joined by my colleagues Senators MURRAY, GRAMS, and BINGAMAN as original cosponsors of the bill, the full text of which I ask be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 2196

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Cardiac Arrest Survival Act''.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress makes the following findings:

(1) Each year more than 350,000 adults suffer cardiac arrest, usually away from a hospital. More than 95 percent of them will die, in many cases, because lifesaving defibrillators arrive on the scene too late, if at all.

(2) These cardiac arrest deaths occur primarily from occult underlying heart disease and from drownings, allergic or sensitivity reactions, or electrical shocks.

(3) Survival from cardiac arrest requires successful early implementation of a chain of events, the chain of survival which begins when the person sustains a cardiac arrest and continues until the person arrives at the hospital.

(4) A successful chain of survival requires the first person on the scene to take rapid and simple initial steps to care for the patient and to assure the patient promptly enters the emergency medical services system.

(5) The first persons on the scene when an arrest occurs are typically lay persons who are friends or family of the victim, fire services, public safety personnel, basic life support emergency medical services providers, teachers, coaches, and supervisors of sports or other extracurricular activities, providers of day care, school bus drivers, lifeguards, attendants at public gatherings, coworkers, and other leaders within the community.

(6) A coordinated Federal response is necessary to ensure that appropriate and timely lifesaving interventions are provided to persons sustaining nontraumatic cardiac arrest. The Federal response should include, but not be limited to—

(A) significantly expanded research concerning the efficacy of various methods of providing immediate out-of-hospital lifesaving interventions to the nontraumatic cardiac arrest patient;

(B) the development of research-based, nationally uniform, easily learned and well retained model core educational content concerning the use of such lifesaving interventions by health care professionals, allied health personnel, emergency medical services personnel, public safety personnel, and other persons who are likely to arrive immediately at the scene of a sudden cardiac arrest;

(C) an identification of the legal, political, financial, and other barriers to implementing these lifesaving interventions; and

(D) the development of model State legislation to reduce identified barriers and to enhance each State's response to this significant problem.

SEC. 3. NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH MODEL PROGRAM ON THE FIRST LINKS IN THE CHAIN OF SURVIVAL.

Section 421 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 285b–3) is amended by adding at the end the following subsection:

''(c) Programs under subsection (a)(1)(E) (relating to emergency medical services and preventive, diagnostic, therapeutic, and rehabilitative approaches) shall include programs for the following:

''(1) The development and dissemination, in coordination with the emergency services guidelines promulgated under section 402(a) of title 23, United States Code, by the Associate Administrator for Traffic Safety Programs, Department of Transportation, of a core content for a model State training program applicable to cardiac arrest for inclusion in appropriate current emergency medical services educational curricula and training programs that address lifesaving interventions, including cardiopulmonary resuscitation and defibrillation. In developing the core content for such program, the Director of the Institute may rely upon the content of similar curricula and training programs developed by national nonprofit entities. The core content of such program—

''(A) may be used by health care professionals, allied health personnel, emergency medical services personnel, public safety personnel, and any other persons who are likely to arrive immediately at the scene of a sudden cardiac arrest (in this subsection referred to as 'cardiac arrest care providers') to provide lifesaving interventions, including cardiopulmonary resuscitation and defibrillation;

''(B) shall include age-specific criteria for the use of particular techniques, which shall include infants and children; and

''(C) shall be reevaluated as additional interventions are shown to be effective.

''(2) The operation of a limited demonstration project to provide training in such core content for cardiac arrest care providers to validate the effectiveness of the training program.

''(3) The definition and identification of cardiac arrest care providers, by personal relationship, exposure to arrest or trauma, occupation (including health professionals), or otherwise, who could provide benefit to victims of out-of-hospital arrest by comprehension of such core content.

''(4) The establishment of criteria for completion and comprehension of such core content, including consideration of inclusion in health and safety educational curricula.

''(5) The identification and development of equipment and supplies that should be accessible to cardiac arrest care providers to permit lifesaving interventions by preplacement of such equipment in appropriate locations insofar as such activities are consistent with the development of the core content and utilize information derived from such studies by the National Institutes of Health on investigation in cardiac resuscitation.

''(6) The development in accordance with this paragraph of model State legislation (or Federal legislation applicable to Federal territories, facilities, and employees). In developing the model legislation, the Director of the Institute shall cooperate with the Attorney General, and may consult with nonprofit private organizations that are involved in the drafting of model State legislation. The model legislation shall be developed in accordance with the following:

''(A) The purpose of the model legislation shall be to ensure—

''(i) access to emergency medical services through consideration of a requirement for public placement of lifesaving equipment; and

''(ii) good samaritan immunity for cardiac arrest care providers; those involved with the instruction of the training programs; and owners and managers of property where equipment is placed.

''(B) In the development of the model legislation, there shall be consideration of requirements for training in the core content and use of lifesaving equipment for State licensure or credentialing of health professionals or other occupations or employment of other individuals who may be defined as cardiac arrest care providers under paragraph (3).

''(7) The coordination of a national database for reporting and collecting information relating to the incidence of cardiac arrest, the circumstances surrounding such arrests, the rate of survival, the effect of age, and whether interventions, including cardiac arrest care provider interventions, or other aspects of the chain of survival, improve the rate of survival. The development of such database shall be coordinated with other existing databases on emergency care that have been developed under the authority of the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration and the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.''.

By Mr. ASHCROFT:

S. 2198. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide for Congressional review of rules establishing or increasing taxes; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

THE TAXPAYERS' DEFENSE ACT

Mr. ASHCROFT. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce the Taxpayer's Defense Act. Quite simply, this bill prohibits any agency from establishing a tax on the American people.

Mr. President, as we all know, the United States was founded on one simple and fundamental principle—no taxation without representation.

In ''The Second Treatise of Government'', John Locke said, ''if anyone shall claim a power to lay and levy taxes on the people . . . without . . . consent of the people, he thereby . . . subverts the end of government.'' According to Locke, consent required agreement by a majority of the people, ''either by themselves or their representatives chosen by them.'' The Declaration of Independence listed, among the despotic acts of King George, his ''imposing taxes on us without our consent.''

The Boston Tea Party remains the symbol of Americans' opposition to taxation without representation. The Constitutional authority—given only to Congress—to establish federal taxes is clear. Its reasoning also is clear. It is the Congress that represents the people. Only Congress considers and weighs every issue that rises to national importance. While federal agencies consider their own priorities to be paramount, only Congress can determine which goals merit a tax on the American people.

The modern era of restricted federal budgets, however, threatens to erode the essential principle of ''no taxation without representation.'' In many subtle and often hidden ways, federal agencies are receiving from Congress the power to tax.

They tax by adding unnecessary charges to legitimate government user fees. They tax through federal mandates. These taxes pass the cost of government on to the American people—without their knowledge.

The worst example of administrative taxation is the Federal Communications Commission's Universal Service tax. ''Universal service'' is the idea that everyone should have access to affordable telecommunications services. It originated at the beginning of the century when the first national telecommunications service was still being created. This idea was expanded in the Telecommunications Act of 1996, which allowed the FCC to extend universal service funds to provide ''discount telecommunications services'' to schools, libraries, and rural health care facilities.

Most importantly, the Act gave the FCC the power to decide the level of ''contributions''—taxes—that telecommunications companies would have to pay to support universal service. The FCC now determines how much must be collected in taxes that subsidize a variety of ''universal service'' spending programs. Long distance providers pass the costs on to consumers in the form of higher telephone bills. In the first half of 1998, the tax was $625 million, and the Clinton Administration's budget projects it will rise to $10 billion per year. This administrative tax is already out of control.

This is possible because Congress delegated its authority to tax. The FCC is able to collect taxpayer dollars at levels it sets—without approval from Congress or the people. The FCC can defy Congress and the people because it has the power to levy taxes.

Mr. President, some people thought the tax and spend liberals had left Washington. Not so. Washington interest groups who want to feed at this new federal trough already are geared up to accuse the Republic Congress of cutting funding for education and health care if any attempt is made to rein in the FCC. They will frame the issue as a matter of federal entitlements for sympathetic causes and groups.

The most sympathetic group is the American taxpayer, whose money is being taken, laundered through the Washington bureaucracy, and returned for purposes set by unelected Washington bureaucrats. This is why the FCC must be required to get the approval of

Congress before setting future tax rates.

Should tax dollars be used for federal universal service programs and what amounts or should Americans spend what they earn on their own, real, local priorities? Requiring Congress to review any administrative taxes would answer this question.

My bill would create a new section to the Congressional Review Act for mandatory review of certain agency rules. Any rule that establishes or raises a tax would have to be submitted to and receive the approval of Congress before taking effect. In essence, the Act would disable agencies from setting taxes, but would allow them to formulate proposals under existing rulemaking procedures.

Once submitted to Congress, a taxing regulation would be introduced in both the House and Senate by the Majority Leader. The rule would then be subject to expedited procedures, allowing a prompt decision on whether or not to approve a rule. The rule would have to be approved by both Houses and signed by the President.

Congress must not allow a federal agency—unelected and unaccountable federal bureaucrats—to determine the amount of taxes hardworking Americans must pay. The Taxpayers' Defense Act will require Congress to stand up and face the American people when it decides to tax. The cry of ''no taxation without representation'' has gone up in the land before, and today we are hearing it again. It is time that we respond.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 1147

At the request of Mr. WELLSTONE, the names of the Senator from New York (Mr. MOYNIHAN) and the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. FAIRCLOTH) were added as cosponsors of S. 1147, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act, Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974, and the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for nondiscriminatory coverage for substance abuse treatment services under private group and individual health coverage.

S. 1251

At the request of Mr. BREAUX, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. KOHL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1251, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the amount of private activity bonds which may be issued in each State, and to index such amount for inflation.

S. 1252

At the request of Mr. D'AMATO, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. KOHL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1252, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the amount of low-income housing credits which may be allocated in each State, and to index such amount for inflation.

S. 1334

At the request of Mr. BOND, the name of the Senator from New York (Mr. MOYNIHAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1334, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to establish a demonstration project to evaluate the feasibility of using the Federal Employees Health Benefits program to ensure the availability of adequate health care for Medicare-eligible beneficiaries under the military health care system.

S. 1423

At the request of Mr. HAGEL, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Mr. MURKOWSKI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1423, a bill to modernize and improve the Federal Home Loan Bank System.

S. 1647

At the request of Mr. BAUCUS, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. CAMPBELL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1647, a bill to reauthorize and make reforms to programs authorized by the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965.

S. 1929

At the request of Mrs. HUTCHISON, the name of the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. ROCKEFELLER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1929, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide tax incentives to encourage production of oil and gas within the United States, and for other purposes.

S. 2112

At the request of Mr. ENZI, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. DODD) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2112, a bill to make the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970 applicable to the United States Postal Service in the same manner as any other employer.

S. 2151

At the request of Mr. NICKLES, the names of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. BROWNBACK), the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAIG), the Senator from Michigan (Mr. ABRAHAM), the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. SANTORUM), the Senator from Colorado (Mr. ALLARD), and the Senator from Iowa (Mr. GRASSLEY) were added as cosponsors of S. 2151, a bill to clarify Federal law to prohibit the dispensing or distribution of a controlled substance for the purpose of causing, or assisting in causing, the suicide, euthanasia, or mercy killing of any individual.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 50

At the request of Mr. BOND, the name of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. COATS) was added as a cosponsor of Senate Joint Resolution 50, a joint resolution to disapprove the rule submitted by the Health Care Financing Administration, Department of Health and Human Services on June 1, 1998, relating to surety bond requirements for home health agencies under the medicare and medicaid programs.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 95

At the request of Mr. DODD, the names of the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS), the Senator from Oregon (Mr. SMITH), and the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. INOUYE) were added as cosponsors of Senate Concurrent Resolution 95, a concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress with respect to promoting coverage of individuals under long-term care insurance.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 104—COMMEMORATING THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE INTEGRATION OF THE ARMED FORCES

Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN (for herself and Mr. LEVIN) submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. CON. RES. 104

Whereas 50 years ago on July 28, 1948, President Truman issued Executive Order No. 9981 that stated that it is essential that there be maintained in the Armed Services of the United States the highest standards of democracy, with equality of treatment and opportunity for all those who serve in our country's defense;

Whereas President Truman declared that there shall be equality of treatment and opportunity for all persons in the Armed Services without regard to race, color, religion, or national origin;

Whereas soon after the Executive order was issued American soldiers fighting in Korea led the way to a fully integrated Army;

Whereas after the enactment of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, the Armed Forces resolved to implement the legislation as a new opportunity to provide all members of the Armed Forces with freedom from discrimination within and outside its military communities;

Whereas the efforts of the Armed Forces to ensure the equality of treatment and opportunity for its members contributed significantly to the advancement of that goal for all Americans;

Whereas minorities serve today in senior leadership positions throughout the Armed Forces, as officers, senior noncommissioned officers, and civilian leaders; and

Whereas the Armed Forces have demonstrated a total and continuing commitment to ensuring the equality of treatment and opportunity for all persons in the Total Force, both military and civilian: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That Congress—

(1) commends the United States Armed Forces for its efforts, leadership, and success in providing equality of treatment and opportunity; and

(2) recognizes the commemoration by the Department of Defense on July 24, 1998, of the 50th anniversary of the integration of the Armed Forces.

SENATE RESOLUTION 252—EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING A RESOLUTION TO THE KASHMIR DISPUTE

Mr. HARKIN (for himself, Mr. BROWNBACK, and Mr. TORRICELLI) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 252

Whereas the detonation of nuclear explosive devices by India and Pakistan in May of 1998 has underscored the need to reexamine relations between India and Pakistan;